

**From:** Archer Richardson [mailto:[archerj@mcn.org](mailto:archerj@mcn.org)]  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 02, 2008 8:21 AM  
**To:** MLPAComments  
**Subject:** MLPA Draft 1

As both a member of a family that will deeply be impacted by this proposal and as a citizen who is deeply concerned about the preservation of our fragile local ecosystem, I have read and reviewed all of the public comments that concern the proposed North Coast MLPA.

There is a common thread in all of these letters, and the bottom line is...fishermen want to fish, and divers want to dive. I personally am both a sport fisherman and an occasional diver. I see that many of the divers and fishermen who are fighting to maintain a place to dive and fish, are bringing to the table the threat of an economic strain that any closure of public land might bring to the local North Coast community. I take that to heart as well, as for many generations members of my family have and will continue to live off of those a portion of those proceeds from both local and tourist divers and fishermen.

**I do understand that the purpose of the MLPA is to preserve and re-populate marine life along our North Coast, but there are two things that I do not understand.**

By popular opinion the decision that many of you are looking for is to establish MLPA's in front of privately owned land, specifically, the areas surrounding Stewarts Point and Sail Rock. These lands and the families that own them have always had a strong reputation for marine life preservation. So why would you want to waste scarce state and private funds to protect areas that are already well protected?

The second thing I do not understand is why divers and fishermen (I am including myself in this group of divers and fishermen) think that the taxpayers and private funders should bend over backwards to allow us the opportunity to keep taking the precious resources we are trying so hard to protect?

The impacted areas along the coastline should be closed for preservation purposes and the MLPA board should not hesitate to do so. These areas have not been managed properly and need to be closed, albeit temporarily or permanently to ensure that the ecosystem is restored.

I am fully in support of the proposal brought forth by the Fisherman's Marketing Association – External Proposal A. I ask the rest of you to ponder the big question in this whole ordeal – “Why should the state bend over backwards to ensure fishing and diving rights to those who have participated in depleting marine populations in impacted areas?”

Kelly S. Richardson, Santa Rosa, California